Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action of **September 2, 2005** and the Advisory Action of **December 28, 2005**. Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 4-8, 14, and 18-27** is respectfully requested.

Summary of the Advisory Action

The request for reconsideration was considered but did not place the application in condition for allowance. However, the Examiner indicated that independent Claim 14 is now found allowable. The Examiner also stated that independent Claim 18 would be allowable if it included the feature of the printer having an idle state during which printing is not performed. Claim 23 would be allowable if it included the feature of wrapping the non-printing task with a functionality label to form a packet.

Present Amendment

With the present amendment, the remaining claims should now be in condition for allowance as indicated by the Examiner. The rejected claims are now canceled. Applicant respectfully requests that the present amendment be entered since it places the application in condition for allowance. Since the amendments are related to features from existing claims, the amendments do not require further search and/or consideration. Indeed, they have already been indicated to be allowable. The particular amendments are explained as follows.

To place the application in condition for allowance, independent claim 1 is now canceled. Dependent claims 2-3 are also canceled. Dependent claims 4-8 have been amended to depend from allowed independent claim 14. The Applicant notes that the term "printing device" has been amended in these claims to the term "printer" to have consistent antecedent basis with claim 14.

Independent claim 14 was indicated as allowable. Thus, Applicant believes claim 14 and its dependent claims 4-8 are now in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 18 was indicated to be allowable if the printer (e.g. to which the packet is transmitted) included an idle state during which printing is not performed. Claim 18 has now been amended to reflect this and should now be in condition for allowance. Thus, dependent claims 19-22 should also be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 23 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner to make the claim allowable. In order to have proper antecedent basis in claim 23, the term "instructions" is used instead of "a functionality label". Applicant now believes claim 23 and its dependent claims 24-27 are now in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 28 is now canceled.

<u>Response to Advisory Action</u>

In view of the statements made in the "Continuation Sheet" of the Advisory Action, Applicant provides the following response.

In line 2 of the Continuation Sheet, it states:

> "...in the Applicant's own Background of the Specification, it discloses that it is already known to perform "non-printing tasks". For example, in page 2, lines 9-16, the printer can perform the task of determining which personality should process the job or to send information (such as updates, results of the print job, and jam or error alerts) or communicate with the host computer."

Applicant respectfully points out that the entire sentence in the specification reads: "When a printer receives a print job, one of the first steps it performs is to determine which personality should process the job." (page 2, line 9-10). Thus, these functions are performed "when a printer receives a print job" and this means that it is performing a "printing task", and not a "non-printing task". Therefore, Applicant asserts that performing non-printing tasks is not disclosed in the Background of the present specification.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 4-8, 14,** and **18-27** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

30- JAN - 2006

PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)

(216) 348-5843

McDonald Hopkins Co., LPA
600 Superior Avenue, E.
Suite 2100
Cleveland, OH 44114